

NEW YORK, NY 10017

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/866,960 05/29/2001 Neil D. Scancarella Rev 01-6 7403 **EXAMINER** 26807 7590 05/17/2006 JULIE BLACKBURN KIM, VICKIE Y REVLON CONSUMER PRODUCTS CORPORATION ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 237 PARK AVENUE

> 1618 DATE MAILED: 05/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/866,960	SCANCARELLA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Vickie Kim	1618	

= 0.0.0 till 1 illing 0. all 1 ipp 0a. 2.10.	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Vickie Kim	1618		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant 	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)	
time periods:	a data of the Control of the			
 a)				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN				
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the value of the period of the value of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action: or (2) as	
	oliopao with 27 CEB 44 27 must be	filed within two ments		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).				
AMENDMENTS				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	ow):	i E delow);		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		otou olamijo.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	s to provide a	
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
13. Other:				
	PR	VICKIE KIM INVARIN EXIMINER Primary Examiner		
		Art Unit 1618		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20060514

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The scope of instant claims are broad enough(e.g. comprising) where the claims are embraced by the teaching of the prior art of the record. It is noted that the claims are drawn to a composition where the structure of the composition(all the ingredients) is same and thus, the claims are met. Applicant argues that the active agent required by the instant claims is used as an optional ingredient in the cited reference (in the rejection). However, once patented composition is formulated based on the suggestion made by patentee, all the ingredients including optional ingredients for extra benefits admixed into the patented composition which clearly suggested in the patent, then, the claimed composition and the patented composition are substantially same since they have same ingredients and thus, the claims are met. Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.